

REMARKS

The undersigned, a pro-se applicant, respectfully requests that if the Examiner finds patentable subject matter disclosed in this application, but feels that Applicant's present claim is not entirely suitable, the Examiner draft one or more allowable claims for applicant.

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated August 15, 2001.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-4 because of informalities. Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett et al (US 5,810,459) in view of Murphy (US 4,979,075). In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett et al in view of Taylor et al (US 4,836,626). Moreover, the Examiner has stated that claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable in rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As instructed by the Examiner, claims 1-4 have been canceled and replaced with new claim 5 which is rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims in order to avoid the objections and rejections. However, if the new claim 5 still does not comply with the requirement, an examiner's amendment is earnestly solicited.



It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Chiang, Ming-Huang
CHIANG, MING-HUANG (INVENTOR)

November 12, 2001

